

22nd November 2012

Renewables Grid Liaison Group

Minutes of Meeting

Attendees	
Utility Regulator	Tanya Hedley (TH) Sarah Friedel (SF)
NIRIG	Mervyn Adams (MAd), Donogh O'Brien (DO), Michael Harper (MH), Meabh Cormacain (MC)
NIE	Robert Wasson (RW), David de Casseres, Gerry Hodgkinson (GH), Michael Atkinson (MA)
SONI	Dick Lewis (DL)
Apologies	See below

No	Item	Action
1	<p>Apologies Robert Wasson arrived later to the meeting and Meabh Cormacain left at 12:00</p>	
2	<p>Minutes from meeting on 11th September It was confirmed by all that the minutes and terms of reference documentation from the meeting on 11th September were in order. The name of the group meeting was re-confirmed as the Renewables Grid Liaison Group (RGLG) The UR will provide a special location on the website with notification of updates to members – a form of registration is required</p>	
3	<p>Cluster Development – including LCTA and per MW offers GH circulated and talked through a number of slides (attached). Following the consultation process an updated methodology was forwarded to the Utility Regulator on 26th October. The UR has highlighted some concerns that require to be considered by NIE particularly around the scenario where one or two turbines fall out during the planning process. The updated methodology has also sought to clarify how NIE will deal with the various steps in the connection offer process where for example the initial offer is made before construction has been approved and adjustments are then based on outturn costs. Also the impact of parties connecting at a later stage. In parallel, an Annex relating to the specifics of cluster charging which will sit within the approved Statement of Charges will be forwarded shortly to the UR. In respect of the charging generally (cf approved Statement of Charges) and stage payments - MA(d) highlighted NIRIG's concern at this point around the stage payments and particularly the level of deposit (10%) required for large connections whilst supporting NIE's need to be cash positive. MA(d) also asked that this matter and the notion of a cap on deposits might be considered in the context of the updated Annex being developed to support cluster charging. GH expressed concern that this could delay approval of the updated SOC however NIE agreed to give this matter due consideration with NIRIG.</p>	<p>NIE</p> <p>NIE</p>

No	Item	Action
	<p>MA(d) referred to the 12 large connection re-quotes required and the importance of arriving at a common approach between NIE and NIRIG members. MA(d) indicated that the majority of NIRIG members were, in his view, supportive of 'per MW' charging approach. This aligns with NIE's view of the best way forward also.</p> <p>MA(d) noted that these quotes had effectively been put on hold and that the planning approval deadlines were fast approaching with an order now of just three years remaining and also that the re-quote process would potentially require much working through.</p> <p>The consensus from NIE and NIRIG was to approach the re-quotes on the 'per MW' basis. TH did not advise any objection from a regulatory viewpoint to this approach. NIE and NIRIG will move forward on this basis.</p> <p>MA(d) also made reference to defining the criteria for entry into the queue – highlighting a preference for planning approval date vs offer acceptance date.</p> <p>DL highlighted the importance of defining the queue from an FAQ perspective</p> <p>GH advised an aspiration to have the updated quotes ready alongside agreement on the FAQ process.</p>	NIE
4	<p>Generation Connection – FAQ process</p> <p>DL updated the group on his understanding of a UREG paper discussed at the Oct 2012 SEM Committee Meeting – SONI / NIE are drafting a consultation response document recommending these views and this will go to the UR shortly for approval.</p> <p>DL's understanding is that the determinant of queue entry, originally the 'planning permission approval date' should shift to the 'application date'.</p> <p>The decision being proposed on FAQ is that [1] for those connected – FAQ = MEC [2] those with offer accepted before December 2010 – FAQ = MEC [3] beyond this all other applications will go into the queue and get a transmission FAQ allocation along with an indication of how and when the FAQ will change. Changes are required to TIA processes to formalise this.</p> <p>DL noted that other parties apart from on shore generators are wishing to connect and must be considered. There will be a separate UR led Offshore generation connection arrangement consultation that will include this issue. DL will take the opportunity to include how other applicants will be treated in the queue in the forthcoming SONI / NIE consultation as well. Also noted that the 'Tie Break' closed Wednesday [Date] – an 'All Island Process'</p> <p>TH indicated that the UR wished to see implementation sooner rather than later – a timeline of four weeks from end November excluding XMAS week</p>	
5	<p>Fund 3</p> <p>No update as Final Determination rejected - other than in the interim submissions should align with RP4.</p>	
6	<p>Offshore Consultation</p> <p>TH indicated that the consultation is expected to go out by end November – and that this would be a full three month consultation exercise.</p>	

No	Item	Action
7	<p>Small Scale Generation – 11kV Network Access</p> <p>GH worked through a number of slides (attached) which outlined the limitations on the 11kV network, the design approach adopted, scope and logistics around increased access, the challenges and next steps.</p> <p>In summary this outlined that there was potential for greater utilisation of the 11kV network either [1] through upgrading or building new circuitry or [2] more sophisticated intervention and voltage control arrangements through SCADA and other technology.</p> <p>There are however a number of significant matters to address including [1] the need for appropriate analytical tools and the investment required to control the arrangement subject to NIE's licence obligations to demand customers and [2] the detailed logistics and rules which would apply to connection generators to ensure a consistent approach and level playing field.</p> <p>MA(d) expressed interest in the presentation from an industry perspective and highlighted a challenge in terms of achieving good industry representation.</p> <p>DL highlighted concerns around reactive power management and the potential for small scale loading at 11kV to result in constraints for large scale generation.</p> <p>It was agreed that a representative from SONI and NIRIG would be nominated and engage (with NIE) in framing a proposal to bring back to the UR for them to consider funding.</p> <p>TH indicated UR support for an initiative in this area</p>	<p>SONI/ NIRIG/ NIE</p>
8	<p>Rebate policy extending beyond domestic customers</p> <p>TH noted that the UR had undertaken to go back to DETI on this matter. NIRIG are to write to DETI to seek an amendment to current legislation.</p> <p>MA(d) questioned whether this matter could be dealt with directly by the UR vs a change in legislation. TH agreed that UR would check licence.</p>	<p>UR NIRIG UR</p>
9	<p>AOB</p> <p>NIE to circulate draft report formats in advance of the next meeting.</p>	<p>NIE</p>
10	<p>Dates for next meetings</p> <p>Dates agreed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 8th January 2013 ▪ 12th March 2013 ▪ 14th May 2013 ▪ 9th July 2013 ▪ 10th Sept 2013 ▪ 12 Nov 2013 	